

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the final Office Action dated May 17, 2005. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, favorable reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34, 39-42 and 52-57 are pending. Claims 12 and 16 have been cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 9-11, 13-15, 34, 39-42, 52 and 54 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the original specification and, therefore, no new matter has been added. Claims 9, 13, 34 and 39 are in independent form.

In the Office Action, Claims 9-16, 34-42 and 52-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,034,970 (*Levac et al.*). In view of that rejection, Applicants submit the following remarks.

Applicants submit that, for at least the reasons set forth below, the independent claims patentably distinguish the invention over the above-noted cited art, and Applicants request favorable reconsideration.

Independent Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, a deletion unit adapted to delete one or more character strings registered in a predetermined file from text detected by a detection unit. Each of independent Claims 13, 34 and 39 recites, *inter alia*, an identical or similar feature.

An example of the above feature is given in the specification at page 14, beginning at line 11. As explained therein, unnecessary character strings registered in the user information file are deleted from new information.

*Levac et al.* relates to an intelligent messaging system and method for providing and updating a message using a communication device, such as a large character display. According to *Levac et al.*, the system automatically conveys messages generated by a variety of sources to designated message recipients via different types of communication devices. A message server automatically dispatches messages and message updates to a communications device interface which converts the messages and updates to a protocol compatible with the types of communications devices used by the message recipients. However, as explained in more detail below, nothing in *Levac et al.* is understood to teach or suggest at least a deletion unit adapted to delete one or more character strings registered in a predetermined file from text detected by a detection unit, as recited in independent Claim 9.

In one embodiment of the *Levac et al.* invention, communication source 12 receives update information from the Internet. The data acquisition program may include a Web scanning program, configured to monitor Internet Website(s). Upon detection of a modification to the information content of the Web site, the data acquisition program can update the variable value in the message template with information providing a notification of the modification. The data acquisition program can then convey the updated message template through automated source interface 22. The notification can be a communication alerting the message recipient of the modification or can include a portion of the modified information content. Col. 10, lines 43-67.

In addition, according to *Levac et al.*, message server 14 transmits server commands, such as an activate message command or a “delete message” command or a “delete all messages” command. Col. 9, lines 25-29. However, this operation of *Levac et*

*al.* is not the same as the operation of the deletion unit recited in independent Claim 9. As recited in Claim 9, a deletion unit is adapted to delete one or more character strings registered in a predetermined file from text detected by a detection unit. Nothing in *Levac et al.* is understood to teach or suggest, e.g., that character strings registered in a predetermined file are deleted from text detected by a detection unit.

Since *Levac et al.* does not contain all of the elements of independent Claim 9, that claim is believed allowable over the cited art. Since each of independent Claims 13, 34 and 39 recites, *inter alia*, a feature identical or similar to the above-noted feature of Claim 9, those claims are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons.


A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Doug W. Pinsky", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas W. Pinsky  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,994

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DWPgmc

DC\_MAIN 215980v1